



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,774	07/19/2001	David Chaiken	AGLE0027	4876
22862	7590	10/05/2004	EXAMINER	
GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025			PATEL, DHAIRYA A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2151	

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/909,774

**Applicant(s)**

CHAIKEN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Dhairya A Patel

**Art Unit**

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/19/2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/29/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Application # 09/909,774 was filed on July 19, 2001. Claims 1-9 are subject to examination.

#### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to because they do not illustrate what is "M" and "N" in figure 4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In Fig. 4, the applicant does not clarify what is "M" and "N". Proper clarification is needed.

#### ***Specification***

3. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Integrated Circuit comprising LDT in a network"

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. In claims 1-9, the applicant mentions "LDT" interface. It is unclear to the examiner the meaning of "LDT". The applicant needs to give more explanation on the topic of "LDT", since that subject matter is being discussed in the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable by Elms et al. U.S. Patent # 5,007,013 (hereinafter Elms) in view of AMD Publication, "AMD Discloses New Technologies At Microprocessor Forum", October 5, 1999. (hereinafter AMD).

5. As per claim 1, Elms teaches a method for interconnecting elements of a network

using an LDT interface in a defined network topology (Fig. 20), comprising steps of interconnecting a plurality of integrated circuits in a multi-dimensional network configuration using an LDT interface (Fig. 20), wherein at least one of said integrated circuits has more than two LDT interfaces (Fig 2 element 42, 44; column 6 lines 30-33) and wherein said integrated circuits are interconnected without requiring an LDT switch.

Elms fail to teach the implement LDT interface in the integrated circuits but it would have been well known at the time of the invention to implement LDT interface in the integrated circuits. It is known to integrate LDT interface in the integrated circuits for increased overall-performance. The motivation for doing so would have been to get a high speed, high performance point-to-point link for interconnecting integrated circuits (AMD).

6. As per claim 2, Elms teaches a method of claim 1, wherein each integrated circuit comprises at least four LDT interfaces (column 6 lines 30-33, Fig. 1 element 36).

Elms fail to teach integrated circuits comprising of LDT interface but it would have been well known at the time of the invention to implement LDT interface in the integrated circuits. It is known to integrate LDT interface in the integrated circuits for increased overall-performance. The motivation for doing so would have been to get a high speed, high performance point-to-point link for interconnecting integrated circuits (AMD).

7. As per claim 3, Elms teaches a method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:  
-assembling integrated circuits having four LDT interfaces into a two-dimensional mesh (Fig. 20).

Elms fail to teach integrated circuits having LDT interface but it would have been well known at the time of the invention to implement LDT interface in the integrated circuits. It is known to integrate LDT interface in the integrated circuits for increased overall-performance. The motivation for doing so would have been to get a high speed, high performance point-to-point link for interconnecting integrated circuits (AMD).

8. As per claim 4, Elms teaches a method of claim 1, further comprising the step of:  
-linking integrated circuits having four LDT interfaces into a PLEX topology.(Fig. 20)

Elms fail to teach integrated circuits having LDT interface but it would have been well known at the time of the invention to implement LDT interface in the integrated circuits. It is known to integrate LDT interface in the integrated circuits for increased overall-performance. The motivation for doing so would have been to get a high speed, high performance point-to-point link for interconnecting integrated circuits (AMD).

9. As per claim 5, it teaches the same limitations as said in claim 1 therefore it is rejected under same basis.

10. As per claim 6, it teaches the same limitations as said in claim 2, therefore it is rejected under same basis.

11. As per claim 7, Elms teaches a network of claim 5, wherein said integrated circuits each comprise four LDT interfaces (column 6 lines 30-33, Fig. 1 element 36).

Elms fail to teach integrated circuits comprising of LDT interface but it would have been well known at the time of the invention to implement LDT interface in the integrated circuits. It is known to integrate LDT interface in the integrated circuits for increased overall-performance. The motivation for doing so would have been to get a

high speed, high performance point-to-point link for interconnecting integrated circuits (AMD).

12. As per claim 8, Elms teaches a network of claim 7, wherein said integrated circuits are assembled into a two-dimensional mesh (Fig. 20).

13. As per claim 9, Elms teaches a network of claim 7, wherein said integrated circuits are linked into a PLEX topology (Fig. 20).

### ***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the applicant (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

16.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairya A Patel whose telephone number is 703-305-0457. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 703-305-6687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAP



**ZARNI MAUNG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**